Scheme and how much of it is in Cotton Corporation o'f India in 1992-93 and 1993-94; and

(b) how much free period is allowed to domestic buyer$_s$ while selling cotton under Maharashtra Cotton Monopoly Scheme and how much is allowed by Cotton Corporation of India 1992-93 and 1993-94?

THE MINISTER OF STATE Or THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY): (a) Total processing cost per candy/per quintal for converting into full pressed bales in respect of Maharashtra Cotton Monopoly Scheme and Cotton Corporation of India is as under: —

Year		Per Candy	Per
1992-93	Cotton Corporation of India.	Rs. 1332	Rs. 374
	Maharashtra Monopoly Scheme.	Rs. 2068	Rs. 580

Since the cotton season 1993-94 is yet to start, it is not possible to indicate the processing costs at this state.

(b) Free period allowed to domestic buyers while selling cotton during the cotton season 1992-93 in respect of Cotton Corporation of India and Maharashtra Cotton Monopoly Scheme is as under;—

Cotton Cropn. of India—a free period of 15 days to 30 days depending up-,.n the quantity of cotton sold to domestic buyers.

Maharashtra Monopoly Scheme :

Suitable adgustmems are made in the policy depending on the market conditions.

No. of Bales.	No. of Days.
1 to 599	21 days
600 to 1499	30 days
1500 to 1999	45 days
2000 to 2999	2 months equally
3000 and above	3 months equally.

Problems of handloom and power-loom weavsrs in Maharashtra and Gujarat

2731. SMT. CHANDRIKA ABHINANDAN JAIN; Will the Minister of TEXTILES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it has come to the notice of Government that handloom and powerioom weavers in Gujarat and Maharashtra states are lacing marketing problems due to recent disturbances in both the States; and

(b) it so, the steps taken/proposed to be taken by Government to help these two sectors in solving their problems?

THE MINSTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF TEXTTLJES (SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY): (a) and (b) The State Governments of Gujarat and Maharashtra have not brought to the notice of the Union Government marketing problems Ifac-ed by the handloom and powerioom weavers due to recent disturbances in both the States. However, the ongoing schemes of the Government namely, grant of Market Development Assistance, organisation of National Handloom Sixmos and setting up of Marketing Complexes by National Handloom Development Corporation are aimed to assist the handloom sector of the State in marketing of their products. In regard to the Powerioom sector, a number o'f schemes are being implemented such as modernisation scheme, formation of powerioom cooperative societies, Workers Insurance Scheme etc.. with a view to assist this sector.

Polices offers by CCI and Maharashtra Monopoly Scheme

273S. MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Will the Minister of TEXTILWB

be pleased to state:

(a) wihther it is a fact that the Cotton Corporation of India is paying more to cotton growers compared to the price paid by Marash-tra in its Monopoly Cotton Scheme including bonus and profit sharing if so, why Cotton Corporation of India and other cooperatives are not allowed to purchase in Maharashtra to help cotton growers of Maharashtra State also; and

(d) what is the profit/loss during the last three years including 1902-93 in Maharashtra Cotton Monopoly Scheme and also in OCI?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI G. VBNKAT SWAMY): (a) Yes, Sir. The Cotton Corporation of India (CCI) and other agencies are not allowed to purchase cotton in Maharashtra in view of the operation of Maharashtra Cotton Monopoly Scheme.

(b) The profitlloss position in respect of Cotton Corporation of India and Maharashtra Monopoly Scheme during the last 3 years is as under; —

(Rs. in crores)

Year	Cotton corpn. of India (Before tax)	Maharashtra Monopoly Scheme
1990-91	68.85	205.82
1991-92	51.98	192.42
1992-93	60.11 (Prov.)	64.00 (approx. expected)

Insisting on Import of silk of International standards

2733. SHRIB. K. HARIPRASAD: Will the Minister of TEXTILES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that almost 75 per cent of the imports *oi* Chinese silk into India is of ungraded quality, unsuitable for manufacture of export worthy products;

(b) whether Government would consider immediate ban on import erf silk from China or at least insist on imports of silk of only 2-A grade or above which meets the International Standards; and

(c) whether it is also a fact that indigenous production htaa almost reached 16,000 tonnes in 1992.93 but there has not been any correspon ding increase in exports of silk goods arid if so, whether Govern ment would follow Thailand where exporters- are only allowed to im port 66 per cent of what they export and are iasked to mix one Kg oi local yarn with every two Kg. of imported variety?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY): (a) to (c) The imports of raw silk are basically allowed under the export promotion schemes of the Export-Import Policy and such imports are made directly by the import licens holders. Government have received representations that low grade raw silks were also being imported and such imports were affecting the prices of indigenous raw silk.

While there is no proposal to impose a foan on imports of raw silk (including Chinese silk), the Government are contemplating varfoual Steps to stablise the prices of indigenous raw silk including review of the provisions of the Advance Licensing Scheme for silk textile products. In this connection, the suggestions for allowing imports of raw silk of only 2-A grade or above and the need to restrict the quantum of imports have been taken note of.